

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the outstanding Office Action dated December 12, 2003 wherein the Examiner allowed claims 5-7, 11-12, 14-18, 21 and 23 but rejected claims 1-2, 4, 8-10, 13, 22, 24 and 27 under 35 USC Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Barton et al. (6233389) and claims 3, 14-15 and 26 under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton in view of Wang (5832181). Reconsideration of these rejections in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The rejection under 35 USC Section 102(e)

The Office Action recites a rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 8-10, 13, 22, 24 and 27 as being anticipated by Barton et al. The rejection states that Barton discloses a device for receiving a video and/or audio signal (see figs. 1-4) comprises an input (101 of fig. 1 or 201-204 of fig. 2) that receives the video and/or audio signal (see figs. 3-4, see col. 3, lines 40-60); **and a user interface (102) that receives a user input (e.g., a user command via CPU 106, see abstract) identifying an event to be detected (see col. 1, line 63 to col. 2, line 38);** a detector (401 of fig. 4 or item 705 of fig. 7) that analyzes the incoming video and/or audio signal of at least one program to detect the identified event (see col. 5, lines 3-32, and col. 6, lines 34-57); and a selector (102 of fig. 1 or 701 of fig. 7)

for automatically, upon detection of the identified event, providing to a display (716) the program containing the event. (See col. 6, line 59 to col. 7, line 4.). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the grounds that Barton does not detect a user-identified event in a video and/or audio signal.

Applicants take this opportunity to explain Applicants' invention with respect to Barton. As explained in Applicants' specification, Applicants' invention pertains to detecting events in a video and/or audio signal. For example a user may select an event to be detected such as a touchdown in a football game. When the system of Applicants' invention detects a touchdown the football game is automatically provided in the display for example, in the picture-in-picture.

Barton on the other hand pertains to a Tivo device, which stores programming for later replay. The events in Barton that are stored are the start of all frames, the start of sequence headers (col. 6 lines 40-43) etc. Not only are these events not in the video and/or audio signal as defined in Applicants' specification at page 2 last paragraph through page 3 first paragraph, but also these are not user-identified events. There is nothing in the cited portions of Barton that teaches the user identifying the "event" of a program header and then the device detecting the program header and immediately displaying it to the user. In fact most users aren't even aware of the fact that there is a program header attached to a video signal. The Examiner pointed to the CPU

106 in Barton as receiving a user command and col. 1, lines 63-
col.2 line 38 as showing that the user input identifies the event
in the video to be detected. Applicants respectfully submit that
the system described in this section of Barton operates quite
differently. Paraphrasing from this section, Barton separates the
MPEG stream into its video and audio components and stores them in
temporary buffers. "Events" are recorded that indicate the type of
component that has been found, where it is located and when it
occurred. When the program is requested for display, the video and
audio components are extracted from the storage device and
reassembled into an MPEG stream. The user control commands affect
the flow of the MPEG stream and allow the user to view stored
programs with at least the following functions: reverse, fast
forward, play, pause, index, fast/slow reverse play etc. There is
nothing in this section of Barton that specifies that the user
identifies the specific event to be detected and the system detects
this event and then displays it. Accordingly Applicants
respectfully submit that the claims are allowable over Barton.

The rejection under 35 USC 103

The Examiner rejected claims 3,14-15 and 26 as being unpatentable
over Barton in view of Wang. The Examiner stated that Barton renders
obvious most claimed features of the invention as applied for the
claim 1 rejection except for the claimed -- user input of audio data
and the speech-recognition device analyzing the audio signal.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons stated above with respect to Barton and because the cited portions of Wang do not make up for the deficiencies in Barton of detecting a user identified event in the video and/or audio signal and then providing to the display the program containing the event. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable over Barton in view of Wang. Entry of this amendment reconsideration of these rejections and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Laurie E. Gathman, Reg.37,520
Attorney
(914) 333-9605

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On JAN, 13, 2004

By 